|    | Kaldhadc   Teleconference   |                                |
|----|---|--------------------------------|
| 1  | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  |                                |
| 2  | SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK                                       |                                |
| 3  | UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,   | New York, N.Y.                 |
| 4  | V .   | 20 Cr. 0468(RMB)               |
| 5  | ROBERT HADDEN,  |                                |
| 6  | Defendant.  |                                |
| 7  | x   |                                |
| 8  |   | 0.1.1.01.0000                  |
| 9  |   | October 21, 2020<br>12:38 p.m. |
| 10 | Before:   |                                |
| 11 | HON. RICHARD M. BERMAN,   |                                |
| 12 | HON. RICHARD M  | . BERMAN,                      |
| 13 |   | District Judge                 |
| 14 | APPEARANCES (via telephone)   |                                |
| 15 | AUDREY STRAUSS  |                                |
| 16 | Acting United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York |                                |
| 17 | BY: JESSICA R. LONERGAN MAURENE R. COMEY                            |                                |
| 18 | LAURA E. POMERANTZ<br>Assistant United States Attorneys             |                                |
| 19 | CLAYMAN & ROSENBERG   |                                |
| 20 | Attorneys for Defendant BY: WAYNE ERVIN GOSNELL, JR.                |                                |
| 21 | ISABELLE KIRSHNER   |                                |
| 22 | Attorney for Defendant  |                                |
| 23 | - also present -  |                                |
| 24 | Erica DePalma, U.S. Pretrial Services (New Jersey)                  |                                |
| 25 |   |                                |

Case 1:20-cr-00468-RMB Document 21 Filed 10/23/20 Page 2 of 31 Kaldhadc Teleconference (Teleconference established) THE CLERK: Judge, we have all the parties and the court reporter. We don't have Pretrial Services on, however. THE COURT: We don't have any Pretrial Services Officer, not New York nor New Jersey? (Pause) THE CLERK: I don't think so, Judge. THE COURT: Well, that is a little bit of a surprise. Chelsea, will you know if they join the call? THE LAW CLERK: Only if it is someone that we've had on before and I see their number. THE COURT: I see. THE LAW CLERK: Christine, who is it supposed to be? I will send them an email.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE CLERK: It was my understanding it is Erica DePalma. Is that correct, Mr. Hadden?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, that's correct.

THE COURT: Is that New York or New Jersey?

THE CLERK: That's New Jersey, Judge.

THE DEFENDANT: That's New Jersey.

THE COURT: I see. OK.

Is there a New York person, too?

THE CLERK: There was a New York person back on November 17th. However, that was not an individual who had a supervisory role in the case.

# Teleconference

THE COURT: OK. All right. Then we'll just wait another minute and see if the New Jersey person comes on.

(Pause)

THE COURT: So this is Judge Berman again. It would be very helpful if everybody who is on this call would mute their phones unless and until such time as they are going to speak as part of the conference.

Any further contact from Pretrial Services?

THE CLERK: Chelsea was going to email. Go ahead.

THE LAW CLERK: I haven't heard anything yet.

THE COURT: Well, then I think we should begin and we'll note the absense of Pretrial Services both from New York and New Jersey. I don't understand it but so be it.

One issue that I wanted to address at the outset is the issue of counsel, and Mr. Hadden has new counsel. I think he sought either CJA or Federal Defenders. And he submitted a financial affidavit in support, which I think is the form that's often used or normally used. But that form is not adequate for my purposes, which is to accurately reflect all income, assets and expenses in a clear and verified format. So this one that has been submitted — and it may be how other people have done it as well, it's not the way I do it.

So I want a -- and particularly when we're talking about someone who has had or has, you know, significant resources as having been a medical doctor, having owned a home

Teleconference

that is valued at somewhere around a half a million dollars, and also is someone who, as has been indicated in prior conferences, had made a transfer of I don't know if it is several hundred thousand dollars or some amount to one of his children to buy a house, etc. I think we need a more professional and up to date financial affidavit.

So, I'm going to want one that is signed and notarized, sworn to under oath, and also is accompanied by a certified financial report prepared by an accountant, or something like that, who knows Mr. Hadden's economic situation, and that should cover the last couple of years prior to the commencement of this lawsuit. So, I want a full and accurate picture of Mr. Hadden's finances and assets and of any financial transfers that have taken place in the last, say, two or three years as well.

THE CLERK: Judge, this is Christine. I'm sorry to interrupt, but I believe we have the Pretrial Services Officer, Erica DePalma, on the line. Is that correct?

OFFICER DePALMA: Yes, Christine. This is Erica DePalma with Pretrial Services in New Jersey. Thank you.

THE COURT: Good to have you.

OFFICER DePALMA: Sorry, Judge.

THE COURT: Yes. So Ms. DePalma, we were just going over Mr. Hadden's application for appointed counsel, and I've been saying that I need more information rather than a

Teleconference

back-of-the-envelope kind of information with respect to that financial affidavit before I can review it and determine whether he is entitled to appointed counsel.

And, Ms. Kirshner, you can explain, to the extent that that needs to be explained, go over that with Mr. Hadden, and I'm going to have to do a do-over, as it were, accompanied by a certified financial statement which covers his finances over the last three years.

MS. KIRSHNER: Your Honor, could we -- I'm just thinking, maybe if we could use the kind of financial affidavit that is used in connection with the preparation of a presentence report, would that be adequate for you?

THE COURT: You know, it sounds good. What I really wanted is I want a detailed picture of his assets and liabilities and income and expenses, certified, over the last three years. So whatever form — and that, of course, would all be sworn to and under oath. Just that.

So what they do is, Pretrial Services, I'm not sure exactly, but if it accomplishes the objective that I want to accomplish, I'll take a look at it. But pretty much what I want is a statement of assets and liabilities and income and expenses detailed over the last three years, covering his positions for the last three years.

So, once I get that, I'll take a look and I'll try and make a determination about whether he qualifies for appointed

Teleconference

counsel. But for the moment, I prefer that current counsel remain in the picture. I don't know how long it will take you all to put that together, but that is what I'm looking for.

Anybody have any questions about that?

(Pause)

So the second issue is I just want to hear from

Pretrial Services how Mr. Hadden is doing with respect to the

terms and conditions of his release. If we could hear --

OFFICER DePALMA: Yes, Judge. To my knowledge, there has not been any issues with Mr. Hadden. He calls in as directed and provides requests when needed, and we have not had any issues with him.

THE COURT: Right. But he has other obligations as terms and conditions of his bail, one of which is to have a mental health evaluation, I think, and also weekly therapeutic counseling. There are other specifics. That's what I'm really trying to find out, if the specifics are being accomplished, and I mean that specifically.

OFFICER DePALMA: Judge, I have spoken with his psychiatrist and psychologist. He's meeting over the phone.

I'm sorry, I have --

(Inaudible)

OFFICER DePALMA: I'm sorry, Judge?

THE COURT: Did you mention a name, and I couldn't get it? We might need to spell it for the court reporter.

# Teleconference

OFFICER DePALMA: OK. I just have to get into his case right now. But I have spoken with the psychiatrist and psychologist. They are meeting on Zoom. The psychiatrist is every three months and the psychologist is weekly.

THE COURT: And could you give us the names -
THE REPORTER: I'm sorry. Is this Pretrial Services
who is speaking? You didn't identify yourself.

OFFICER DePALMA: Yes.

THE REPORTER: All right. Thank you.

OFFICER DePALMA: Sorry.

THE COURT: And could you give us the names --

MR. GOSNELL: Your Honor, this is Wayne Gosnell for Mr. Hadden. We would ask that any names of psychiatrists or therapists, that if the Court needs that information, that that be provided by Pretrial Services. It is essentially not public because just in the same way that we've had the issue of not having the suretors be public, it is our expectation that this would subject those individuals to targeting by members of the public who have an agenda, and it really just isn't appropriate under the circumstances here.

THE COURT: Yes. I'm really -- I understood that with respect to the suretors. I don't understand it with respect to professionals, and so over your objection, I'm going to ask for the names of those individuals from the Pretrial Services Officer.

# Teleconference

OFFICER DePALMA: Sure, Judge. Susan Powers is his psychologist, and the psychiatrist -- I'm just trying to get his information -- Dr. Marantz.

THE COURT: Can you spell it?

OFFICER DePALMA: M, as in Michael, a-r-a-n, as in Nancy, t, as in Tom, z.

THE COURT: OK. And in terms of the psychologist, there have been weekly meetings since I imposed --

OFFICER DePALMA: These are -- yes, Judge. These are telehealth sessions so they are done over the phone.

THE COURT: And are there any other aspects of bail that you are familiar with that are not being -- anything that's not being complied with?

OFFICER DePALMA: No, Judge.

THE COURT: OK. So the other -- another issue that I wish to deal with, which has come up, which is the issue of documents that have been discussed in one or more of our conferences so far. There are also documents referred to in some instances in terms of transcripts of, for example, plea hearings in Mr. Hadden's state court case and also sentencing hearing, and I will get more specific about those documents in a moment.

There has been a request from the media -- in particular, The New York Times has asked for those documents, or documents which have made it to me either by request or

# Teleconference

by -- request by me or that have been the subject of other proceedings in which there is, you know, disagreement or -- and so those are the documents which I am going to address at this time.

There are one or two, by the way, documents that came up in the course of our prior conferences. One is related to -- one is termed a Molineux motion. It was my understanding at the conference in which that was discussed that the defense counsel was going to make available to me at least the defense counsel opposition or submission with respect to that motion. I never got it. So, I'm still looking for that. And if I'm not mistaken, defense counsel was also going to send over a copy of the indictment in state court. I don't know if I got that either. I don't think so.

So if Ms. Kirshner or Mr. Gosnell could locate those materials? If you look through the transcript, you'll find that they were specifically discussed, and I think one or both of you volunteered to send them over to me and for whatever reason it just didn't happen yet. I would love to see those.

Is that all right?

MR. GOSNELL: Your Honor, this is Wayne Gosnell.

I suppose the issue here is it somewhat depends on how the Court intends to rule on our motion not to file these documents publicly. At the moment, the <a href="Molineux">Molineux</a> motion and certainly the other documents that were --

# Teleconference

THE COURT: Mr. Gosnell, I think you've got the wrong issue, frankly and respectfully. If you look through the transcript of our proceedings, you will find either you and/or Ms. Kirshner said that they would send those documents to me, and that has not happened. And so I would like you to review the transcripts and then send that to me along with the indictment. So what I do with it we'll get to in a minute, but I was surprised, frankly, that I didn't receive those documents by now.

So is that your understanding, what my request is? My request is that you look through the transcripts and see if you did make that commitment and, for whatever reason, you didn't follow through on that commitment. OK?

MR. GOSNELL: This is Wayne Gosnell.

Yes, we will do that.

THE COURT: OK. So for purposes of this ruling, we'll hold at least the Molineux aside and until I get it and read it. But, also, when you look through the transcripts, you'll find out, which I'm sure you have by now, that there was discussion about those documents already. And so what I'm concerned about is that we haven't had any substantial proceedings here yet, we're just sort of getting organized, but the one substantive issue that has been discussed on several occasions is bail. And the issue of bail is of serious concern to me since I'm essentially supervisor in a way -- not the

Teleconference

direct supervisor, that would be Pretrial Services, but I am in a way the assessor of whether the bail conditions are working and appropriate, and it is in that context that I have asked for and for the most part received these other documents.

So, I had requested documents from the New York State court proceeding, the plea transcript and the sentencing transcript, as well as a copy of the State court plea agreement. I did receive those documents via email on September 19. In the email -- I think this was from Ms. Lonergan -- she wrote that while the two transcripts are publicly available, the plea agreement and the email were not made part of the public record in the State case, and, as such, she wrote it is the parties' preference that at least the plea agreement and the email not be publicly docketed. I am going to address those documents in about a minute from now.

By letter dated September 29, defense counsel has indicated that docketing the New York State court materials would bring about additional adverse pretrial publicity for Mr. Hadden and violate his Sixth Amendment right to a fair trial by an impartial jury. Close quote. That's the September 29, 2020 defense letter.

Counsel acknowledges that the New York State transcripts and indictment are publicly-filed documents and that the information contained in something called the Risk Assessment Instrument was repeated during the New York State

Teleconference sentencing proceedings.

And with regard to the plea agreement and the email, defense counsel states that, "The nonpublic nature of those documents is based upon the practices of the New York County District Attorney's Office. We leave it to" -- from the defense: "we leave it to that Office to explain its practices and why. In addition to our arguments, these documents should remain non-public."

And then by letter dated October 1, 2020, the government states — this is a quote — "To the extent the Court relied on the publicly—available documents from the prior" — that is to say, the New York County District Attorney's Office" — proceedings making a judicial determination in the instant case, the government does not object to the docketing of those documents in this case. As to the non-public documents, because they do not appear to be relied upon in any judicial decision in this case, the government respectfully submits that those materials are not judicial documents subject to public docketing at this time."

So, here's the issue. Of course, everybody recognizes that the public has a right of access to criminal judicial proceedings and judicial documents. The cite is Nixon v.

Warner Communications, 435 U.S. 589, a 1978 case. Also, I'm relying on Lugosch, L-u-g-o-s-c-h, v. Pyramid Company, 435 F.3d 110, a Second Circuit decision from 2006. And so we know in

Teleconference

these essentially balancing situations where the rights of privacy sometimes on one hand and the rights of the public to know and have the information on the other hand, we do a balancing test. That is why you've made the submissions, the lawyers have, that you've made and why we've discussed these documents at various proceedings up until now. And so these are the documents that I have been balancing in my mind the issues of potential privacy. Frankly, I didn't see much that was private in those documents, given the nature and the venues in which they were discussed and analyzed.

But I balance that on the one hand and the public's right to know on the other hand as to the physical safety and privacy interest of any innocent third parties as well as those rights of defendant that may be harmed by disclosure of the material should weigh heavily in the Court's balancing equation in determining what should remain sealed and what should be redacted. So another authority I'm referring to is <a href="New York">New York</a>
Times Company, 828 F.2d 110, a Second Circuit case from 1987.

I'm also of course aware of and reliant on federal statutes. One is 18 United States Code, Section 3142(g), which states that: "The judicial officer shall, in determining whether there are conditions of release that would reasonably assure the appearance of the person as required and the safety of any other person and the community, shall take into account" — this is the bail statute — "shall take into

Teleconference

account the available information concerning, among other things, the history and the characteristics of the person, including his character, physical and mental condition, family ties, employment, financial resources, length of residence in the community, community ties, past conduct, history relating to drug or alcohol abuse, criminal history, and record concerning appearance at court proceedings and also whether at the time of the current alleged offense or arrest he was on probation or parole or on such other release pending trial, sentencing, appeal, or completion of sentence for an offense under federal, state or local law."

And, finally, that statute section I am referring to concludes: "Also, the nature and seriousness of the danger to any person or the community that would be posed by the person's release."

So, this is the bail statute. We know that bail has been set by the Magistrate Judge. We know that I am concerned, because we've had very extensive discussions about whether the conditions of bail have been met, including in my introductory remarks today to find out from the Pretrial Services Officer whether in fact those conditions, which, incidentally, to which I made a modification at one of the more recent conferences. So, these documents are of paramount concern and importance in their contents to me in connection with the bail statute.

There is another statute which I've already relied

Teleconference

upon, which is 18 United States Code, Section 3142(c)(3), which states that: "The judicial officer may at any time amend the order to impose additional or different conditions of release."

And that is a statute I relied upon when I introduced the requirement that there be weekly mental health counseling as a condition of bail.

So, those are the premises for which I reviewed the documents at issue today.

The government contends that there is no indication that the Court has relied on any of the public documents in these proceedings, nor have the parties relied upon the nonpublic documents in arguments made to the Court. I take objection with that statement by the government. I think that it is very clear from the transcript, again, my interest in the -- and my role with respect to the bail conditions and the rather detailed discussions that we've about some of these very documents.

So in determining whether the bail conditions are and were sufficient, I reviewed the New York State plea transcript, the New York State sentencing transcript, the Risk Assessment Instrument, the New York State plea agreement, and an email between Assistant District Attorney Gaffney, G-a-f-f-n-e-y, and defense counsel Kirshner, K-i-r-s-h-n-e-r, and Gosnell, G-o-s-n-e-l-l. These materials are and were clearly relevant to the Court's assessment of whether the bail conditions are

Teleconference

sufficient as the materials concern, among other things, the history and characteristics of the defendant as well as his criminal history and I underscore, among other things, factors that the Court must, and I have, analyzed under 18 United States Code, Section 3142(g).

Now, I started with mentioning the Molineux papers, and I do hope you all go back to the transcript and see where those were discussed. My ruling today will not directly concern the Molineux papers because I never got them, and I will review them once they are received and I will determine whether or not they are useful and connected to any of the legal purposes for which we review such materials.

In the New York State plea transcript, the Assistant District Attorney Millendorf, M-i-l-l-e-n-d-o-r-f, stated that:
"Prior to going on the record today" -- this is the plea transcript that you should refer to to see if the quote is correct, dated February 23, 2016. Millendorf stated that:
"Prior to going on the record today, the defendant" -- and the defendant in that case was also Mr. Hadden, the same as the defendant in this case -- "and the people have signed three copies each, which we are filing and serving at this time, of a written waiver of a right to appeal, a written plea agreement, and the previously agreed upon" -- and then there is a sort of a pause. "The defendant did also sign a copy of the written order from the Office of Professional Medical Conduct

Teleconference

discussing the surrender of his medical licensure in New York and his agreement not to seek such licensure" -- that's his medical license -- "in another state. So we are not providing the Court with a copy of the OPM plea agreement, but we will be providing the Court with the plea agreement in writing and a written waiver of the right to appeal, and defense counsel also has copies of these and I'm handing those up now."

That's in the state court proceeding back in 2016.

Also, in the New York State plea transcript, defense counsel Kirshner stated: "I just -- I would like to incorporate by reference, although I'm not going to provide to Court, I received an email from Ms. Daphne, dated February 11, 2016, which goes to greater detail as to the crimes that will be covered by the plea." That's found in the February (inaudible) 2016 plea transcript.

THE REPORTER: Your Honor, hi. This is the court reporter. Somebody is making some noise that is stepping over you and I am losing some of your words.

If I could once again please implore everybody, except for your Honor, to please put your phones on mute because it is blocking out some of the words that you are saying.

THE COURT: OK. So that's a fair point by the court reporter, that we have a lot of people on the line, and if you all could mute your phones at such times as you are not speaking as part of the hearing. That is a good point.

# Teleconference

In the New York State transcript, sentencing transcript -- I was just talking about the plea transcript, but now I'm referring to the sentencing transcript -- the Assistant District Attorney Millendorf stated: "We've shown that the SORA Risk Assessment Instrument to the Court beforehand and defense counsel."

Then the following colloquy occurred among counsel and the Court — this is the state court — about the contents of the Risk Assessment Instrument. And ADA Millendorf stated that, "The points assessed are as follows." So the Risk Assessment document is a calculation of various points ascribed to the offense conduct, which is me summarizing, and those points get added up to determine what the sex offender status of in this case Mr. Hadden should be. And so he's saying — Millendorf is saying that, "The points assessed are as follows. And as far as the corroboration that goes to each of these sets of points, each of these points are covered in both the indictment and the plea itself. So, there's no need to submit additional evidence or documentation at this time."

And he goes on to say, "There are 25 points here assessed for category number 2." And then he says, "Sexual intercourse, deviate sexual intercourse, or aggravated sexual abuse." that is the category he's discussing for which 25 points have been assessed.

He goes on to say that, "30 points assessed in

Teleconference

category number 3 for the number of victims, which is assessed here as three or more, because this category is assigned to the number of victims covered in the accusatory instrument."

And he goes on to say, "There are 20 points assessed in category number 7, Relationship with Victim, a category defined as stranger or established for purpose of victimizing or professional relationship. And there are 15 points here assessed for category 14. And then being released without supervision, and that brings us to a presumptive category of two with a total of 90 points." So this is the Assistant District Attorney describing how the Risk assessment at this stage, anyway, at the stage I've stopped quoting him, is 90 points.

The next to speak is Defense Counsel Kirshner, and she says — and this is not to me, this is to the state court judge: "Your Honor, at this time, as per our agreement, we're going to move for a downward departure from the finding so that the Court can come to a finding of level one, which was a zero to 70." So level 1 is the, as I understand it, the lowest level of supervision of a sex offender, and the maximum number of points for that category is 70. Mr. Millendorf had already said that they were at 90. So she's making an application and she goes on to say: "As we discussed, that finding is based on the fact that in some ways the fact that he" — Mr. Madden — Hadden, rather, excuse me — "not being placed on probation is

Teleconference

working to his detriment, and everyone agrees that a probationary subpoena is not necessary in this case, that whatever occurred occurred in his office and not out among the general public and that we have now two years of — almost two years of the pendency of this case, almost four years since the incident that one of the victims addressed without any incident. And with those three factors in mind, and with no objection from the District Attorney's office, the Court has agreed to a downward departure to a level one."

So, this is the application and motion with respect to what level of supervision will be required as a result of the sentence in that case.

Then the Court steps in and says: "Is that correct, there's no objection by the people?"

And ADA Millendorf says, in response to the Judge's question: "We agree, the Risk Assessment Instrument does not take those factors into account and defer to the Court's decision."

And Ms. Kirshner then says: "Is that a yes?"

And Mr. Millendorf says: "Yes."

Then the Court goes on to say: "The defendant will be sentenced as a level one sex offender."

And you can find that in the March 29, 2016 sentencing transcript at page 8, lines 21 through 24.

The email reviewed by the Court dated 2/11/16, which

Teleconference

was from ADA Gaffney to defense counsel Kirshner and Gosnell, among other things, the email mentions an alleged abuse that occurred in either April or May of 2011 that was brought to the attention of the District Attorney's Office in November 2015 that was encompassed as one of the offenses covered by the plea agreement entered into by the defendant in New York State court.

So, those pretty much I think encompass the documents which I have received, and I have done the aforementioned balancing in my analysis and here's what I conclude. As the New York State documents were relied upon in conducting and/or reviewing the bail review and as these documents were either publicly filed either in state court -- well, or discussed and referenced in the publicly-filed documents that I mentioned, then I concluded, on balance, that there does not appear to be any persuasive physical safety and/or privacy interest of innocent third parties or of the defendant, Mr. Hadden, that will be harmed by disclosure. And in that balancing, I've concluded that the public's right to know, to have access, is paramount at least with respect to the documents I'm talking about.

And, consequently, I am going to file on the public docket these documents -- the New York State -- well, I am going to file this when I get it -- the indictment, also the New York State plea transcript, also the New York State

Teleconference

sentencing transcript, also the Risk Assessment Instrument, also the New York State plea agreement, and also the email dated February 11, 2016 between ADA Gaffney and defense counsel Kirshner and Gosnell.

I will hold off, because I haven't gotten or reviewed the so-called Molineux papers, and I will reserve decision until such time as I get a chance to review them. I hope that will be in the next day or two from defense counsel.

By the way, with respect to the documents that I've just mentioned, my plan would be to redact email and/or home addresses that may be contained in any of those documents from public filing.

So that's the issue I wanted to go over for today.

There may be other issues -- well, there certainly are issues that you all may want to raise and discuss, and I'm happy to do it.

So, anything from the government that you wish to raise today?

MS. LONERGAN: Yes, your Honor. Briefly, I would like to raise two issues.

First, returning to the very first issue in this conference, which is -- has to do with appointment of counsel for the defendant, the government just wanted to know for the Court that the government, with respect to conflicts, if and when it comes time to appoint counsel, on the CJA panel the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Teleconference

government is only aware of conflicts with Debevoise and with Paul Weiss, and then the government is not aware of any conflicts with the Federal Defenders.

THE COURT: OK. That is helpful. So it's Debevoise and Paul Weiss, did you say?

MS. LONERGAN: That's correct, your Honor.

THE COURT: OK. So, OK, that leaves it wide open pretty much. The list is rather extensive but that's very valuable and helpful to know.

MS. LONERGAN: And then the second -- the second thing is just a request from the government, which is that the government takes its responsibilities and obligations to notify everyone of the conference and the dial-in information for the conference prior to the conference. And so this is just a request from the government that if it is possible to provide the dial-in information 24 hours in advance of the conference, or to tell us now that the dial-in information will always be the same, that would be very helpful -- I'm going to say 24 hours; it could be 24 hours or more -- just so that we're not reaching out to plaintiffs' counsel and to the other victim notification services, you know, just the evening before the conference. So that is just a request from us going forward, if we could have a little bit more notice of the dial-in information so that we could make sure we timely comply with our obligations.

# Teleconference

THE COURT: Yes. So that's more than reasonable. I don't know, and I'm reluctant to say that -- well, maybe Chelsea can help us out with that. I don't know if it is always going to be the same security code number, but I'm very glad that you raised the topic. It's very important to us that we notify the persons who are -- the persons who need to be notified, in addition to the litigants and counsel, of course. The top of my list is the victims, who are called victims. And so we will certainly accommodate you in that regard.

I'm going to ask -- well, I won't do it now. I don't want to put Chelsea on the spot to say whether it is always the same security code, but we'll get back to you about that. And we certainly are happy to give you at least 24 hours notice.

And you can always call chambers and ask for Chelsea or Christine if you haven't gotten that notification and you think -- and you know there is something coming up, we'll certainly make it available to you right then and there.

MS. LONERGAN: Understood, your Honor. And we thank you very much. And those were the only two points that the government wished to raise at this conference besides what the Court has already addressed.

THE COURT: Just by way of information, were you able to make a notification to the victims of today's proceeding?

Did you have the security code adequately in advance for that purpose?

# Teleconference

MS. LONERGAN: Yes, your Honor. We received it, say, mid or late yesterday afternoon. As soon as we received it, we circulated it and put it in a variety of places that we put it. So we hope that the victims were — they should have all at least — you know, we started the notification process yesterday before the end of the day, but, you know, I just — I think a little bit more notice would be helpful for them. You know, we — our office has a practice or can send out individual letters or individual emails as well as notifying the victims through counsel, but if we're going to do that, send out letters or emails, then we need at least — I think for letters we need a week notice, and then for emails it may not be a week, maybe we will do it in a couple of days.

But I think what makes sense, your Honor, is that we -- we will keep track of, of course, the conference dates, they're always in our calendar, and we will -- we will be responsible for contacting chambers, you know, even a week in advance to get the information such that we can make sure we have enough time to notify the victims in all the different ways that we do.

THE COURT: That's great and I appreciate that. We will absolutely make it our business to tell you what the security code is. I think for the foreseeable future, by the way, we will be operating by these telephone conferences. I think that is almost certainly going to be true for the balance

Teleconference

of 2020. And I think that is even -- I'm sure that's true of my docket in other cases but particularly I think it's going to be true here, either, because I don't believe that, because of the pandemic, that the court or the courtroom is quite ready for not only the litigants and their counsel but also the victims to be physically present in, for example, my own courtroom. So I don't think it would be feasible to do it in any other way at this time, but that's just a heads up.

But I will absolutely guarantee to you that we will be able to give you security code notification information well in advance of any conference or hearing or proceeding that --

MS. LONERGAN: We appreciate that, your Honor, and, again, we will also take it upon ourself to contact chambers, because we know, of course, that everyone is busy and we'll make sure that we do that. So those were the only issues that the government wished to raise with the Court today.

THE COURT: Do you have any comment on status of the case in terms of, I don't know, discovery or where things are -- how things are going in that regard?

MS. LONERGAN: Yes, your Honor. So in some sense we are at the same place, unfortunately, that we were at the last conference. In light of the counsel situation, defense counsel, it has been current counsel's position, which we completely understand, that they don't wish to enter into a protective order if they're not going to stay in the case

# Teleconference

longterm. And so in some sense we have been waiting to resolve the question of longterm counsel before we can have productive discussions about a protective order. And in light of the allegations and the discovery materials in this case, there is really very little we can produce without a protective order.

That said, we are moving forward on doing what we can do, and so one of the things we have been engaged in with current counsel on is the privilege review of the seized materials, and so the government is working to get that privilege review underway so that once the counsel situation is resolved, once we have a protective order, hopefully those privilege reviews will already be underway and then it will make it so that we can produce, you know, the electronic materials in a faster way. So we are moving ahead as we can, and, hopefully, after the Court's conversation today with defense counsel, we can resolve the counsel situation in the near future and then we can move forward with conversations about the protective order and then with producing discovery.

THE COURT: That's great. I just got the financial affidavit with respect to Mr. Hadden I think just in the last two days or so. So if I had gotten it sooner, I would have sent up a red flag because I have an issue. But be that as it may, I think no harm done, we'll get there.

And while I have you, one more thing, Ms. Lonergan.

It might have been you who mentioned in one of our proceedings,

Teleconference

perhaps on September 25, that you had located a copy of the indictment and that you were going to send that to me. I think --

MS. LONERGAN: Yes, your Honor. I believe that we have it. I will confirm with my co-counsel, but I believe that we have the state indictment. And as soon as we locate it, we will -- we can send it to chambers. We will send it by email, copying defense counsel.

THE COURT: Great. Thank you very much.

OK. So, defense counsel, did you want to say anything? Make any --

MS. KIRSHNER: No, your Honor. We will consult with Mr. Hadden, and get you back with the financial affidavit as soon as we can.

THE COURT: OK. Any idea? I won't, you know, hold you to it but --

MS. KIRSHNER: I'm assuming he is going to have to go to an accountant and get the statement. I don't know how one accomplishes a notary these days, but I guess we can figure that out.

THE COURT: Yes, OK. So as soon as you can -- well, obviously, you are interested in getting it done soon as well.

MS. KIRSHNER: Right.

THE COURT: OK. And if you could send me the documents that you mentioned that you would send, if you could

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

Teleconference

1 do that before the end of the week, that would be great.

MR. GOSNELL: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: OK. I think that's about it.

So, let's see. Assuming that the information, I'm quessing, would be prepared and ready, do you think,

Ms. Kirshner, within two weeks, three weeks at the most?

MS. KIRSHNER: I would guess, Judge. I have no idea.

THE COURT: OK. So, Chelsea or Christine, Christine, how about a date two weeks from now or so?

THE CLERK: Yes, Judge.

THE COURT: What dates would that be? It could be a little bit -- with Election Day, it is going to be --

THE CLERK: Judge, how is November 10th at 11:30?

MR. GOSNELL: Your Honor, this is Wayne Gosnell.

I'm actually scheduled to have an oral argument in the Appellate Division that day. If we could have it a different day, I would appreciate it.

THE COURT: OK.

THE CLERK: Judge, how is November 9 at 12:30?

THE COURT: Is that a Monday?

THE CLERK: It is.

THE COURT: I would prefer, if you could, November 11,

23 | if we've got something?

THE CLERK: It is a court holiday, Judge. It is

25 Veterans Day.

# Teleconference

THE COURT: Oh. And what about the 12th? Is that a weekday?

THE CLERK: The 12th is a Thursday, Judge, 9:30.

THE COURT: Yes. November 12, 9:30. Is that agreeable to everybody?

MS. KIRSHNER: Yes, Judge.

MR. GOSNELL: Yes.

THE COURT: Good. All right --

MS. LONERGAN: Yes, your Honor. This is Jessica Lonergan. Yes for the government.

THE COURT: OK. Is there an issue or application with respect to speedy trial that we need to deal with?

MS. LONERGAN: Yes, your Honor.

At this time, the government would move to exclude time under the Speedy Trial Act from now until November 12th. This will allow the defendant to work out the question of his representation, which is necessary for proceeding forward with the case, and also will allow the parties to continue to engage in conversations regarding any sort of pretrial disposition, should that be pertinent at this time.

THE COURT: OK. Thank you.

I'm going to find, under 18 United States Code,
Section 3161, that the request for adjournment, joined in by
both sides, is appropriate and warrants exclusion of the
adjourned time from speedy trial calculations. I further find

Teleconference

that the exclusion is designed to prevent any possible miscarriage of justice, to facilitate these proceedings, including resolution of the issue of defense counsel, and to guarantee effective representation of and preparation by counsel for both parties, and, thus, the need for exclusion and the ends of justice outweigh the interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial pursuant to 18 U.S.C., Section 3161(h)(7)(A) and (B).

So, unless that's it, Christine, if you could call me after we hang up from this call?

THE CLERK: Yes, Judge.

THE COURT: We are adjourned for today. Thanks, everybody. Thanks for your help and thanks for Probation from New Jersey for being here.

MR. GOSNELL: Thank you, your Honor.

MS. LONERGAN: Thank you.

MS. KIRSHNER: Thank you, your Honor.

(Adjourned)